---------- Reviewer A: Recommendation: Resubmit for Review ---------- 1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article Regular Remarks 2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section. Poor Remarks Should be restructured considering clearly background, Objective(s) and methods. 3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner Regular Remarks Problematic and objectives should be clearly presented. 4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis. Regular Remarks It needs to be more clarifications and improvement. (see annotated manuscript, attached). 5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee,	Reply Was modified to accommodate requirement Presented well Was done

informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics? Yes 6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown. Regular Remarks Results presentation and analysis need deep improvements. 7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design. Regular Remarks Should focus more on findings interpretation with comparison to previous studies reported in the literature. Deep improvement is needed. 8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study. Regular Remarks Too short. more details should be provided on the study findings implications. 9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format. Regular Remarks More references need to be incorporation to support findings and statements. 10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or	Done and modified Modified as needed Was done according to study objective All needed references were included

grammar mistakes? Requires a thorough assessment of grammar and spelling	Was done
11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it The paper is not well structured. Inadequate and unfocused topic sentences and statements. The paper needs proofreading for language and style improvement. It's crucial!! --- --- Reviewer B: Recommendation: Revisions Required --- 1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article Regular Remarks Prevalence and Molecular Characterization of Giardia spp. of Dogs in Egypt and Its Zoonotic Implication 2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section. Regular Remarks Need modification. suggested in the file attached 3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and	All remarks and defects in style improvement and proofreading were done Ok Done

detailed manner Poor Remarks Need modification. suggested in the file attached 4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis. Regular Remarks Need modification. suggested in the file attached 5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics? Yes 6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown. Regular Remarks Need modification. suggested in the file attached 7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design. Poor	Done Done and modified

Remarks Need modification. suggested in the file attached 8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study. Regular Remarks Need modification. suggested in the file attached 9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format. Regular Remarks Need modification. suggested in the file attached 10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes? Requires a thorough assessment of grammar and spelling 11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it The manuscript needs thorough revision. ----------	Done and modified Done Done Done Done Done again

Review 2

Reviewer A:

- The manuscript has been substantially improved.

- Reviewer's comments and queries have been addressed.

- Suggest to use "giardiasis" (as the authors used giardiasis and giardiosis in the same document).

- Giardia should be in italics, but not giardias).

- A very few rare corrections have been highlighted in the attached manuscript.

Recommendation: Accept Submission

Reviewer B:

The language used in the manuscript has to be improved. There are serious errors that happened in the preparation of the manuscript.Hence, it needs further revision. I have attached the manuscript along with corrections as track changes or comments. Please advise the authors to improve the manuscript. There is no mention of the size of the product anywhere in the manuscript. Conducting phylogeny using a sequence below 400 bp is of no use.

Recommendation: Revisions Required

All requests and demands of reviwers were done

Review 3

1. The amplicon size should be mentioned in the M&M and results section. In the figure, it is shown as 590 kDa which is wrong. I think it is 590 bp.	Has been modified
2. The sequence of the isolate of the present study may be submitted to GenBank and the accession number may be shown in the phylogenetic tree constructed.	Not has an accession number to gene bank
3. The reference writing style is not checked by this reviewer.	Revised according to Vancouver style
4. Many typos are indicated in the track changes format. Please correct them.	All typos have been corrected